

NORTHGATE STAKEHOLDERS GROUP MEETING SUMMARY

**North Seattle Community College
ED 2843A in the Dr. Peter Ku Education Building
Tuesday, March 15, 2005, 4:10 pm – 7:10 pm**

The Northgate Stakeholders Group (Group) held its thirteenth meeting at North Seattle Community College on Tuesday, March 15, 2005 from 4:10 pm to 7:10 pm. The purposes of the meeting were to:

- Approve meeting summary #12;
- Discuss the Stakeholders Group's remaining work and future activity;
- Hear responses to questions about the Lorig/ERA Care development proposal for South Lot, continue deliberation, and begin drafting advice;
- Prepare Stakeholders' comments to the March 21 Early Design Guidance meeting with the Design Review Board.

Welcome/Agenda Review/Reports

Ron LaFayette, Chair, convened the meeting at 4:10 and briefly reviewed the agenda.

Report of the March 7 Technical Design Workshop

The Chair asked for a report of the March 7 Technical Design Workshop from Michelle Rupp and Barbara Maxwell who participated in the workshop on behalf of the Stakeholders. Ms. Rupp described the format of the meeting which consisted of a plenary session followed by work in two small groups. She said she felt her small group had had very productive discussions on pedestrian movements. She said she was very excited about the ways project proponents were thinking and working to create a "sense of place" in the Northgate area. In her report, Ms. Maxwell read a set of questions posed for her small group's work. She said her group had included a number of dynamic people and it had been a challenge to participate and to articulate community perspectives in ways that elicited responses from the other small group members. She said her group had latched onto coordinating sites by the use of street trees.

Report of the March 8 Informal Discussions with Lorig Associates

The Chair asked Shawn Olesen for a report. Mr. Olesen said that about 20 people had participated in the discussion. Parking had been a major topic; possible use of 3rd Ave. NE by Metro buses had also been discussed. Barbara Maxwell said she felt the discussion had been a good opportunity to exchange views with the different interests who were there and that the discussion had been a valuable use of time.

Report of the March 8 Community Forum

The Chair asked Shawn Olesen and Barbara Maxwell, who had moderated the Community Forum in the absence of the Chair and Vice-Chair, to give a report. Mr. Olesen briefly described the format of the meeting and indicated it had ended before the scheduled time. He said the presentations by Bruce Lorig and by Miranda Maupin (Seattle Public Utilities) had been similar to those given at previous Stakeholders Group meetings. Meeting attendees had asked questions about parking and pedestrian issues as well as about potential retail tenants. He also recalled that Janet Way had asked at the meeting about the possibility of an opinion poll.

Ms. Maxwell added that Tony Mazzella of the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) had given a brief update about the Coordinated Transportation Investment Plan (CTIP) and responded to questions. She also noted that SDOT had demonstrated a modeling program being used for CTIP during the open house part of the meeting which many people had found interesting.

Mike Vincent added that the issue of sidewalks had been raised a half dozen times during the meeting along with questions about the library/community center groundbreaking. He also noted that parking had been raised as a concern.

Brad Larsen said he felt there had not been a lot of time for citizen input at the meeting. He also felt that the presentations were brief, without enough detail on shared parking and the future closing the Park & Ride at 5th Ave and NE 112th. Even so, he said, a number of those who had commented had focused on parking as a key issue.

In response to the suggestion of a possible opinion poll, Mark Troxel of the Department of Planning and Development (DPD) indicated that he had spoken with Jan Brucker in advance of the Community Forum, to explore what would be an effective way to get input from the public. After discussion, he said, they had agreed that using a comment sheet as a way to poll those who attended the public meeting was unlikely to give a good indication of opinions held by the broader public. Later in the meeting, it was agreed that the facilitation team would develop questions and work with DPD to distribute them via email to those who have shown interest (by attending meetings or by being on the electronic distribution list for the project) as a way to get input from a broader group.

Sandra Morgan mentioned and read from a postcard that she had received from Lloyd Weatherford of the Carpenters' Union raising concerns about the potential impact of the reduced parking that Lorig was requesting relative to what is required in the land use code. The post card had encouraged recipients to attend the March 21 Early Design Guidance meeting of the Design Review Board and express their opinions.

Northgate Revitalization Project Status Report

Jackie Kirn of the Office of Policy and Management reviewed a handout (on pink paper) that provided information about events, projects and activities in the Northgate area in the following categories:

- Recent events
- Upcoming events
- South Lot
- Northgate Mall Expansion
- 5th Ave NE Street Improvements Project. Ms. Kirn suggested that the 5th Ave NE Streetscape Subcommittee review the memorandum it had prepared in fall 2004, revise if appropriate, and submit it as formal advice which could guide the project as it proceeds to final design.
- Pedestrian connection between Northgate North (Target) and Northgate Mall
- Northgate Neighborhood Arts Council
- Maple Leaf Community Garden: Barbara Maxwell indicated that Maple Leaf would apply for a grant on April 4 and was seeking pledges of labor hours and equipment that could be used as in-kind match.
- Neighborhood Business District Strategy Land Use Code amendments
- Pinehurst Park: Lorna Mrachek reported that Pinehurst had held the first of three public meetings for the Pinehurst Pocket Park to be located on currently vacant land on the northeast corner of NE 117th St and 19th Ave NE; meeting participants had been ebullient, she said, at the prospect of a park there.

Ms. Kirn asked Stakeholder Kevin Wallace to describe a project his family is considering in the Northgate area. Mr. Wallace indicated that their property is located on the southeast corner of 5th Ave. NE and Northgate Way and occupies about three-fourths of an acre. He said he had no other information to share at this time.

Meeting Summary

The Chair asked the Group for comments on the draft summary of the February 24 meeting. Since there were none, the summary was approved as submitted.

Review of Impact of Stakeholders Group Advice and Projected Future Activity

Alice Shorett, meeting facilitator, briefly reviewed a ledger-sized document in members' packets that DPD had prepared to show the impact that the Group's four pieces of formal advice and its input to the City Council on incorporating the Northgate Comprehensive Plan into the City's Comprehensive Plan to date had had to date.

The document also looked ahead to future Stakeholders Group activities, after completion of advice on the Lorig/ERA Care facility on March 29. Future activities for Stakeholders Group meetings included providing advice on CTIP evaluation criteria and future opportunities in early July and providing advice on CTIP priority projects and programs in late September. CTIP Subcommittee meetings would be in addition to these Stakeholders Group meetings.

In the "future" part of the document, nine projects/activities were identified that the Group was expected to want to follow via periodic updates. Ron Posthuma

recommended that the Park & Ride at 5th Ave NE and NE 112th be added to the list of items to follow in the future.

In response to a question about the potential role the Stakeholders could play relative to projects identified for periodic updates, facilitator Alice Shorett noted that even if the Group did not have a formal role to play with respect to issues of interest or concern (such as the Monorail or Link Light Rail) because they were outside the Group's charter, the Group could nonetheless offer its opinion.

Ms. Kirn recalled that the fundamental purpose of the Stakeholders Group had been to enable Stakeholders to influence projects at the conceptual level. In return, she said, the City had committed to keep the Stakeholders informed as projects evolved so Stakeholders could come back in at formal points in the process. With fewer meetings planned in the future, she said the City could come back at the next meeting with options for continued communications.

A member suggested that some larger projects, including that of Kevin Wallace and possibly others along Northgate Way to the east, would be "self-triggering." Ron Posthuma commented that Metro's Transit-Oriented Development project could accelerate if other development in the Northgate area were to occur.

Presentation of the Lorig/ERA Care Proposal for South Lot and Deliberation

David Harrison, who facilitated this portion of the meeting, briefly oriented the Group to the status of its discussions relative to the Lorig/ERA Care proposal. The goal of discussion at this meeting, he said, was twofold:

- To provide direction that would allow him to draft advice on the Lorig/ERA Care proposal for Stakeholders' consideration in advance of the March 29 meeting, to be finalized at that meeting, and
- To provide guidance to Michelle Rupp who would speak on behalf of the Stakeholders at the March 21 Design Review Board meeting.

He pointed out that the Group had received two handouts. One described South Lot issues that were still works in progress (blue paper); a second responded to questions about the proposed parking reduction (yellow paper).

With respect to the Design Review Board meeting, he noted that John Shaw of DPD, who would facilitate the March 21 Design Review Board meeting, had made a suggestion for how the Stakeholders might structure their comments to fit with the Design Review Board's comment structure and the issues it addresses. However, Mr. Harrison pointed out that the Stakeholders' advice was to the larger community and noted that the Group's input into the Design Review Board was not its only vehicle for expressing its views. He reminded the Group that because of the quasi-judicial role the City Council would play in deciding on the contract rezone requests, Stakeholders' advice would not go directly to the Council. Rather, it would become a part of the formal record that would be sent to

the City Council for its consideration. At the same time, he said, the Group's advice would go to the Mayor and executive staff as it had in the past and they have multiple ways they deal with developers.

Over the course of three or four presentations by Lorig/ERA Care and Stakeholders' discussions, Mr. Harrison said that two issues of concern had emerged: the proposed parking reduction and the request for a height variance. In light of these discussions, he proposed drafting advice that would have four sections:

- A general introduction that spoke of the Group's desire for pedestrian friendliness and the integration of the project with the larger community;
- A section that presented the Stakeholders' advice relative to the two contract rezone requests (parking and height);
- A third section that addressed non contract rezone issues that were significant to the Stakeholders; and
- A fourth section that articulated the Stakeholders' desire to monitor the project as it goes forward.

Mr. Harrison proposed and the Group accepted the following order of proceeding:

- A report of Stakeholders' informal discussion with Lorig Associates on March 8 prior to the Community Forum (described above on page 1; additional comments related to parking are presented below on page 10);
- A presentation by Steve Bollinger and Richard Loo of Lorig Associates to provide additional information about the parking reduction proposal and the height variance;
- Stakeholders' preparation of what the Group wanted to say at the March 21 Design Review Board.

Lorig/ERA Care Presentation

Richard Loo, Lorig Associates architect, handed out a packet which Lorig had sent earlier in the day to the Design Review Board in preparation for the March 21 Early Design Guidance meeting. Mr. Loo noted that in its early stages, the project had anticipated more retail; the project had since been revised to focus on a more pedestrian-friendly environment with more residential housing. Mr. Loo presented the current proposal using the graphics in the packets and a PowerPoint presentation. The proposal featured buildings that step down in the interior toward the channel with pedestrian connections and links to the east and south. He said 12'-wide sidewalks were proposed for the entire perimeter of the site. He said that 16'-wide sidewalks would make the ERA Care project infeasible. He said the Lorig project was also very tight on its site, from all directions.

He said Lorig intended this to be an urban village and was working on developing corner plazas and special places where people could congregate, even with 12'-wide sidewalks. He said that Lorig had hired Mithun to begin working on drainage and that work was underway. With respect to the pedestrian experience approaching the project from 3rd Ave. NE, he said Lorig hoped to have small-scale retail there. While they hoped for a grocery store, he said, so far they did not have such a tenant.

Jeff Reibman of Weber+Thompson, architect for ERA Care, then briefly presented visuals that showed other ERA Care facilities, the proposed site plan for South Lot, floor plans for the different levels of the facility, and the interplay between the channel and the ERA Care facility.

Steve Bollinger then addressed the parking issue. He said Lorig was really hoping to get the Group's approval of its proposed approach to parking – a supply/demand approach, presented visually in a series of pie charts, rather than a fixed number of spaces – combined with shared parking with Metro/King County. He noted that the program would change if a grocery store were to become a tenant.

He described the major components of the parking proposal as follows:

- **Condominiums:** Parking for these units would be segregated and dedicated; 1.5 stalls per unit were proposed. In response to a later question, he said that each unit would have one stall; a second stall would be available for purchase but, of course, it would be expensive because providing parking is expensive. He also said that their experience at other facilities indicated that owners often sold their second car. He expected a similar result at Northgate, especially with transit so close by.
- **ERA Care parking** would also be dedicated; parking was proposed at a rate of .55 cars per unit. Parking for staff would also be provided; full staffing would range from 12 to 17 people. Mr. Riebman said that tenants often had a car when they moved into ERA Care facilities, but over time, many sold them. On a national average, he said, parking for seniors was provided at .53 stalls per unit. Stakeholder Sandra Morgan who works at Foundation Housing for seniors said their experience corroborated ERA Care's projection that parking demand did diminish after two or three years.
- **Residential and retail** would share parking with Metro/King County. He said if Lorig's parking projections were not right on the mark, Lorig had the opportunity to revise its use of Metro's park and ride lot upward.

Mr. Bollinger pointed to developments Lorig had built at Overlake and at Uwajimaya, which have vacant stalls at every hour of the day, as examples that supported a reduced need for parking compared to the requirement in Seattle's land use code. He said Lorig was looking for an affirmation from the Stakeholders of its proposed approach.

The Group focused its discussion first on the height issue.

Contract Rezone Request to Raise the Height Limit for the ERA Care Project

Question: Is the requested change for ERA Care, for the Lorig project, or for both.

Response: Mr. Loo clarified that the change was needed both for the ERA Care facility and for Lorig buildings.

Question: Does any part of the project fit within the 65' height limit?

Response (Mr. Loo): Yes. He pointed to a visual in their packets that showed the height variance was needed because of the lower level of the land in the interior of the

project, not along the perimeter where all buildings were within the 65'-height limit.

(Mr. Riebman): ERA Care is above 65' on the creek side but below that street side.

Question: Is a setback of the building from the west side of the channel required?

Response (Mr. Riebman): No, there is no setback requirement from the west side of the channel.

Question: What are the heights of the surrounding buildings, across from the proposed development?

Response (John Shaw, DPD): The height limit across 5th Ave. NE is 30'; across 100th, the height limit is 65'. Group Health Cooperative is zoned at 65'; he said he was unsure of the height to the southeast but thought it was probably 30'.

Geri Beardsley, City Council staff, reminded the Group that the City Council, not the Design Review Board, would make the final decision about the project height. If the Council approved the request, it would rezone the entire project. She said that comments to the Design Review Board could be helpful but the Design Review Board did not have the authority to grant a "departure" or contract rezone.

Comment: It seems a revised height limit is reasonable to consider but I would like to see a "give back" in return that encourages public activity and enhances the pedestrian environment. She also indicated that it was not appropriate to dismiss the buildings across 5th Ave NE which were built on a hill, which might experience privacy issues as a result of the project. She further noted that with respect to parking and vehicular access, it was important to recognize that curb cuts and driveways affect pedestrians. She said she was interested in how the ERA Care project would greet and welcome pedestrians. She later added that pedestrian walkways would be important to the connectivity with the rest of the site and that Stakeholders would want to have an idea of how they would develop.

Response (Jeff Riebman): These are the kinds of comments we typically get from the Design Review Board. He indicated he was in favor of vitality and that ERA Care might want to increase its transparency to the street or perhaps enhance the waiting space outside its entry. With respect to the pedestrian walkways, he said that they were mostly not on the ERA Care property but that they intended to work cooperatively on this issue.

Question: Are overhangs or awnings planned street side?

Response (Jeff Riebman): We have not looked into this issue yet. If we do have them, they would need to be a series of stepped overhangs because of the slope.

Comment: I feel the curb cuts for the drive through are too close together.

Response (John Shaw): This comment could go into the advice to the Design Review Board and it could consider it.

Summary and Direction for Drafting Advice on ERA Care Facility Height

For purposes of drafting, the Stakeholders input on the height of the ERA Care facility was as follows.

The Stakeholders have reviewed the ERA Care proposal and are comfortable with the plans provided. Stakeholders are hopeful that the Design Review Board and the developers will work on access to the site so the entrances are inviting and open to the street at NE 100th and 5th Ave. NE and encourage pedestrian activity as compensation for the increased height. Stakeholders consider pedestrian connections, with good connectivity inside and to the outside, to be very important. Stakeholders are also concerned about curb cuts and vehicular access and their possible impact on pedestrians.

A straw poll of the Stakeholders indicated unanimous support for the summary as direction for drafting the advice. It was clarified that this straw poll was intended only to be guidance for the facilitation team in drafting advice for Stakeholders Group review and discussion on March 29. The straw poll should in no way be considered a formal vote by the Stakeholders on its final advice on this issue.

Lorig Proposal Issues (without parking which is discussed below)

The Stakeholders Group next turned to issues of the Lorig proposal, without parking.

Comment: With respect to visual 4.1 in the members' packets, a member encouraged Lorig to consider use of natural drainage systems – "the more natural, the better."

Response (Richard Loo): Three-fourths of the site is covered by underground parking garage. We are looking at all feasible options, but we may not be able to use natural drainage system for the whole project.

Response (David Harrison): Stakeholders could flag this as an issue you want to continue to follow.

Question: The blue sheet refers to a SPU/Lorig drainage workshop. Could Stakeholders participate?

Response (Jackie Kirn): Yes, we can work something out.

Comment: A member commented that the presentation of trees recalled little tin soldiers, which might, moreover, block the view of the channel, and she expressed hope for a more relaxed, natural feeling.

Response (Richard Loo): He agreed the trees looked too rigid. He said Lorig certainly did not expect the trees to block the view onto the creek.

(Steve Bollinger): That issue has arisen in our workshops with Seattle Public Utilities (SPU). Lorig is talking about the landscaping of transitional areas.

Comment: A member encouraged Lorig to look at Freeway Park as an example, with its "randomly-placed" trees which the public enjoys.

Comment: I'm happy Lorig isn't building a 12-story office building which the land use code would allow.

Comment: We should mention that Flexcar and TDM are proposed as a part of the project.

Question: When do we find out about drainage for the parking garage?

Question: In one of the drawings, there is only one crossing over the channel. The connections shown there could continue into the development. Are they there?

Response (Richard Loo): We intend to continue to work with SPU at the corners and on pedestrian connections through this super block.

Question: Where are the urban space and the public town square element in this development as required in city code #2371. The code is very specific; your proposal is vague. Who decides if the requirement has been met?

Response (Richard Loo): We are working on three nodes, two at the entry points and one in the interior.

(John Shaw, DPD) DPD makes the determination of whether or not the requirement has been met. We will look at this issue.

Request to DPD Director Diane Sugimura: Please describe the "director's rule" that allows a city department director to change the height of a building.

Response (Diane Sugimura): The "director's rule" is a response to the fact that some sites have anomalous (uneven) grades and is intended to allow a reasonable building to be built on such sites, especially those with a dip in the middle. The rule does not allow the director to add additional floors.

Question: How much would the project change if the first floor were to turn into residential rather than retail use?

Response (Steve Bollinger): I doubt it will change to residential but access and circulation could change if that were to happen.

Comment: It would be great to see a grocery store included. It's an important function for an urban center. If the Stakeholders could do anything to encourage its inclusion, we'd be glad to.

Response (member Shawn Olesen): As a prime contractor who has built 16 stores, he cautioned the group about wanting a grocery store that had no "back."

Response: As a counter example, the member pointed to the QFC at Roosevelt which has no "back" and is attractive. She reiterated that a grocery store provides an important function and encourages people to be out of their cars.

Comment: If we as Stakeholders support any code departure, we should make it very specific to this project because of the site grades and the fact that it's located in an area with multiple allowed building heights.

Question/comment: Is there any discussion about microwave or cell phone towers? I'm pleased that less height capacity is being used than would be allowed by zoning and agree with comments about the importance of transparency of buildings to the community.

Comment: The comments made earlier relative to the ERA Care facility about encouraging pedestrian connections and enlivening the pedestrian environment also apply to the Lorig project. The member read the following excerpt from the Northgate Urban Center and Overlay District Design Guidelines: "Livelier street edges make for safer streets. Ensure that buildings have visual interest and quality at street level, at human scale, with accessible, comfortable spaces that encourage pedestrian activity." She stressed the importance of the public rights of way and connections to them and how they relate to the transparency of buildings, the way buildings look from the street edge. She said she thought the internal parts of the buildings looked great, in part because of the natural corridor through them. She said she wanted the perimeter and street edges to be as nice or nicer. She said she was concerned about transparency on NE 103rd, about how those buildings would look to those outside and how they would meet and interact with 103rd, 5th Ave. NE, and the new 3rd Ave NE.

Summary and Direction for Drafting Advice on the Lorig Proposal Relative to Height

For purposes of drafting, the following summary was suggested:

The Stakeholders endorse Lorig's height departure request and the advice will detail the specific issues and flag matters of strong interest and concern raised during the discussion, including

- improvements in pedestrian circulation and connections,
- transparency of buildings along the outside perimeter so it is as attractive from the outside street edge as it is from the inside,
- landscaping with a natural feel,
- more developed public open spaces both inside the site and as gateways welcoming pedestrians into the site,
- connections to the channel, and
- use of natural drainage to the maximum extent possible.

The straw poll was unanimous as direction to drafting advice.

Lorig Proposal for Parking

Mr. Harrison reminded the Group that Lorig was asking for an endorsement of the Lorig approach to parking – which consists of a specific supply/demand approach based on projections combined with shared parking with Metro – not just for approval of the specific reduction in the number of parking spaces.

General Parking Questions

Question: I'm comfortable with shared parking but what will happen if demand increases in the future?

Response (Ron Posthuma): Metro hopes to maintain the number of park and ride lot stalls we have today, 1400. Several meetings ago, we provided information that showed the park and ride supply over time. Part of the thinking is that light rail will come to Northgate and then move beyond Northgate. Metro is limited in its resources for building more capacity. If we over build, that would also be a problem.

Comment/Question: In the informal discussion with Lorig, there were a lot of assumptions made about parking demand. I understand that Lorig has every incentive to provide adequate parking so his retail tenants and residents are satisfied. I'm strongly in favor of a nice development in this area. This proposal is beautiful and I want to encourage it. However, if the assumptions are wrong, if the number of spaces provided is inadequate, if the demand for park and ride increases, and if transportation demand management (TDM) is successful in getting residents to leave their cars in the lot, what are the consequences? Where will people park? I would expect Northgate Mall to be very concerned about its parking garage.

Response (Jackie Kirn): Item #6 on the yellow sheet lists measures available to provide course correction. So, one response could be to increase the amount of shared parking. Other measures are also available.

(Steve Bollinger): We feel most vulnerable at the evening transition period. We feel pretty comfortable with the flexibility we have and the management tools available to us.

Suggestion: It may be that as Northgate becomes a "neat" place to be that the City could allow Pedi cab franchises and other non-vehicular approaches to let people move through Northgate without the use of cars.

Comment: The Northgate Overlay does not allow shared parking at Northgate.

Response (Steve Bollinger): That is why Lorig is requesting a contract rezone for parking.

Question: I was previously unaware that Lorig was giving stalls back to Metro for daytime use; this is good. When Lorig tenants use Metro's park and ride, how will Metro get them out so that commuters can use them?

Response (Ron Posthuma): Metro typically does not tow cars unless the cars have been there for a long time (usually when there are abandoned cars), but we do have the right to tow. He noted that in the existing shared-use facilities, this has not been a problem to date.

Comment (Steve Bollinger): In response to the postcard that Mr. Weatherford of the Carpenter's Union had sent to the community, he said that Lorig feels we are adding to the supply of public parking.

Finally, the Stakeholders Group turned to a discussion of parking impacts of the proposal.

Parking: ERA Care

Question: How does ERA Care deal with visitor parking?

Response (Jeff Riebman): A lot of traffic is pick-up/drop-off, so we have included a turn-around for short-term demand. We also have extra spaces within the garage for visitors. He again noted that over time residents tended to sell their cars.

Comment: ERA is asking for a big drop in the parking required in the City's land use code.

Response (Jeff Riebman): Seattle does not give a parking reduction for senior housing, only for assisted living. However, the national standard for senior housing parking is at the lower rate.

Parking: Lorig

Question: What would Lorig say if the city asked Lorig to build the number of spaces required in Seattle's land use code?

Response (Steve Bollinger): The project would not be financially feasible.

Question: What's the experience of visitor parking at Lorig projects?

Response (Mr. Bollinger): We made actual counts at Uwajimaya and at Overlake that included residents and visitors. The count at Uwajimaya was .78 cars per unit; at Overlake, it was .58 cars per unit. Flexcar plays an important role.

Comment: Overlake focuses on low income housing and Uwajimaya is next to a transit center, but in Northgate, people own and use their cars.

Response: Sixty per cent of Overlake housing is workforce housing, but it's certainly an area where people should own cars. Uwajimaya is downtown, with transit next to it which provides easy access to many destinations.

Comment: Comment: When I first heard of the shared parking proposal, I expected to see a modest amount proposed but Lorig is proposing a reduction of 350 spots – a 40% reduction of parking from code requirements. This is a reduction of roughly a whole level of underground parking. The shared parking figures presented to us account for less than one-half of these reductions. Since parking is underground, there would not be a lot of room to adjust if change were needed.

Clarification (David Harrison): Shared parking is not intended to meet the whole reduction. Lorig is proposing a two-tiered approach that combines a supply/demand projection with the use of shared parking.

Comment: There are a lot of good reasons to support shared parking with good transit nearby, but I'm troubled by the expectation that half of the residents drive away and half of the park and ride lot users drive in. I care about the health of other businesses in the area and hope they will not be compromised by the lack of parking. We have to recognize that the assumptions and the numbers are prepared by project advocates and assume they are made in good faith, but we must also recognize potential downsides. We must also potentially consider the use of tools listed on the yellow page, like restricted parking zones (RPZs).

Response (Steve Bollinger): In our other projects, we generally experience 60% of people leave on a daily basis. At Overlake we have less vehicle ownership. As noted earlier, we have vacant stalls all day, every day. Lorig does not feel that the code reflects real demand.

Question: Is there a plan to have everyone pay for parking?

Response: Yes, residential parking will be paid. We are not sure about retail.

Comment: When there's a charge, people generally park on the street or elsewhere.

Summary and Direction for Drafting Advice on the Lorig Proposal Relative to Parking

David Harrison noted the excellent questions and discussion the Group had had. He pointed out that the Group had three choices about its advice relative to parking: it could endorse the Lorig approach to parking, or acknowledge it (without comment), or oppose it. If the Group were to endorse it, it would be with the understanding that the Group wanted a high degree of focus on management approaches to address overages.

In the straw poll that followed, 11 members voted to endorse the approach; one member voted to acknowledge the parking issue; and one member opposed the approach. This straw vote, as its predecessors, was direction to the facilitation team on drafting the advice.

Stakeholder Comments at the March 21 Design Review Board

Based on the discussions at this meeting, Michelle Rupp and other Stakeholders who spoke at the Design Review Board could say that there was a strong likelihood that the Group would endorse the requested contract rezone requests related to height and parking. Our spokesperson would also note the Stakeholders' expectations of "give backs" and compensations that benefit the pedestrian environment and connections as a result of support for Group support for raising the height limit. Finally, she will say that the Group has not yet made a formal decision; that decision is expected on March 29.

Public Comment

The chair called on Kent Meyer to offer a comment.

Kent Meyer: Noting that he had spent a lot of time at these meetings, Mr. Meyer said he had expected commercial interests to push their interests to the limits, but he said he was disappointed that those on the Group who are supposed to represent the people had chosen to focus on their own parochial interests and not on the needs of people a half mile away. While the Group had spent time debating 12'-wide versus 16'-wide sidewalks, there were no sidewalks around his home at all. With respect to Lorig's estimates that were based on Overlake, he questioned their relevance to Northgate because Overlake is a low-income residence where Northgate will be "high roller" area. He recommended that members of the Group go to the apartments on 5th Ave NE and ask about the parking provided relative to the parking needed. Rather than working on the basis of conjecture, he said he would like to see what is really representative of this area. He concluded that there is no free lunch.

The Chair reminded the Group that it meets again on March 29, when Michelle Rupp will chair the meeting in his absence. The focus of that meeting will be hearing a report of the Early Design Guidance meeting on March 21 and completing advice on the Lorig/Era Care proposal for South Lot, and completing advice on 5th Avenue Streetscape.

The meeting adjourned at 7:10 PM.

Northgate 3/15 Flip Charts

Flip charts:

Is the demand/supply model of parking management appropriate to parking in the Lorig/ERA Care project?

City code calls for 900 parking spaces

Height- request for code departure: City Council for rezone of entire site

“Departure decision is City Council

Support for 85’ from 65’

Assists ERA Care to built to height;

would assist in stepping down buildings to the channel

Giving back by encouraging human activity on the street; pedestrian environment on 5th Ave encouraged in exchange for extra height.

Height across 5th is zoned L3 or 30’

Group Health is zoned at 65’

Parking

EAR Care: recognize curb cuts and vehicular access. How will it address?

75 stalls proprietary. Proprietary stalls set at .55 stalls per unit (.3 stalls is national standard for senior housing parking) This is for residents and visitors

How do you figure in visitor parking?

How do you provide entrance to be inviting?

Reply: include turn around in front.

People move in with cars but gradually get rid of them

How many workers at ERA Care? Fully staffed have 12-17 people; we provide parking for them.

Overlake is in area where people own cars.

Stakeholder advice: ERA Care

Issues: Stakeholders reviewed property, comfortable with plans and acknowledge the tradeoffs between additional height and

Access to the site so entrances are inviting and activity and openness to the street at corners of NE 100th and 5th

Pedestrian connections are important to describe (connectivity inside and outside)

Curb cuts and vehicular access (an issue to take into consideration)

Straw vote to DH: all yeas with further recognition

All Lorig issues except parking

Community goal from Ngate Urban Center and Overlay District Design Guidelines:

Community goal: provide comfort, visual interest activity for pedestrians. Development

objective: “”Livelier street edges make for safer streets. Ensure that buildings have

visual interest and quality at street level, at human scale, with accessible, comfortable spaces that encourage pedestrian activity.

Public rights of way surrounding and connections.

Intent on height: to transition along channel to first 100' – moved bulk of project away from open space

Flexcar and TDM are a good thing – Lorig willing and bless sponsorship

Encourage continue to work on natural drainage aspects, “the more natural, the better.”

Ex” Freeway park

Favor a more natural feeling; landscape, inviting trees.. Trees not blocking views.

Happy Lorig isn't building a 12-story office building on site which he could have built under the code

How it looks from street edge

The internal parts of buildings will be fabulous

Asking for street edges on perimeter to be as fabulous

Transparency on 103rd, 5th Ave and 100th and new 3rd Ave NE (height, bulk, scale)

Stress how the whole development relates to context

Pedestrian connections and “permeable” site on edges ERA Care

Add connections through

Encourage further development of public open spaces inside the site and connections to the channel

3 nodes: what defines as “open space” detailed requirements of 2371 in the code

Retail space: how much will it change if turns into first floor residential

Response: footprint at groundlevel could vary depending on tenants

Grocery store is important function for urban center – support for it focus on function and what it does for the community.

Shawn: be careful - back

Pleased that a lot less height capacity being used on site than possible

Context: stakeholders are requesting here (grading issue) and property itself has multiple elevations

Transparency is really important.

Lorig – Parking – a contract rezone

What are consequences if parking estimates are wrong and parking does not work?

“course correction” on yellow sheet and flexibility offered through the adaptive tools

Encourage non-vehicular transportation in the city of Seattle

When Lorig tenants are using King County stalls, how do you police and manage between the King County and Lorig spots?

Response: will co-manage; residents who park in P&R – shared use, get tough on non-resident commuters

How will it work with condo units and # of cars

Issues:

1. Reduced projection of demand
2. use of shared space

Departure request: 350 fewer spaces than code calls for

Straw vote: support proposal with caveats for flexibility and monitoring
Reasons to support shared parking with transit close by
Tradeoff transit support of environment with trips in and out of the lots

Health of other businesses in area are not compromised
Ex: RPZs in more detail
Want a back-up plan (monitoring, adapting)

Straw vote:

- Endorse parking departure request with caveats: 11
- Acknowledge the departure request: 1
- Oppose the parking revisions